arXiv:1304.4404v1 [math.AG] 16 Apr 2013

ON THE CHOW RING OF BIRATIONAL IRREDUCIBLE SYMPLECTIC VARIETIES

ULRIKE GREINER

Abstract. We show that under a certain condition the graded Chow rings of two birational irreducible symplectic varieties are isomorphic. This lifts a result known for the cohomology algebras to the level of Chow rings, despite of the non-injectivity of the cycle class map. In the special case of general Mukai flops, we present an alternative approach based on explicit calculations.

1. Introduction

An *irreducible symplectic variety* or *algebraic hyperkähler manifold* is a simply connected, non-singular, complex projective variety with a nowhere degenerate two-form σ generating $H^0(X, \Omega_X^2)$. Two important series of examples are provided by Hilbert schemes of points $\mathrm{Hilb}^n(S)$ on a K3 surface S and generalized Kummer varieties $K_n(A)$ associated to an abelian surface A.

Huybrechts showed in [Huy99, Theorem 4.6] that any two birational irreducible symplectic varieties X and X' admit one-dimensional (not necessarily projective) deformations $\mathscr{X}$ and $\mathscr{X}'$, which are isomorphic away from the special fibre. Under a mild technical condition (†) on X and X' (see Section 2.1), these families indeed exist as algebraic varieties.

The main result of this article is the following:

Theorem 2.6. *Let X and X' be birational irreducible symplectic varieties satisfying* (†). *Then there exists a correspondence* $[Z]_* : \mathrm{CH}(X) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{CH}(X')$ *which is an isomorphism of graded rings.*

Consider families $\mathscr{X}$ and $\mathscr{X}'$ as above and let Z be the limit of the graphs of isomorphisms $\mathscr{X}_t \cong \mathscr{X}'_t$. Then $[Z]$ is known to yield an isomorphism $[Z]_*^H : H^*(X, \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{\cong} H^*(X', \mathbb{Z})$ of graded rings (cf. Section 2.2). Using the cycle class map, one could try to deduce Theorem 2.6 from this statement. However, the kernel of the cycle class map $\mathrm{CH}(X) \to H^*(X, \mathbb{Z})$ is very big. Already for a K3 surface it is infinite dimensional, due to the classical result of Mumford [Mum69].

Instead, we use specialization for Chow rings in families to prove multiplicativity and invertibility of $[Z]_*$ directly (cf. Section 2.4).

As an application of Theorem 2.6, we study questions related to the Bloch–Beilinson conjecture, which was in fact our original motivation. We first observe that the termination of the conjectural Bloch–Beilinson filtration is invariant under birational correspondences satisfying (†). Secondly we study conjectures of Beauville (see [Bea07]) and Voisin (see [Voi08]) predicting injectivity of the cycle class map on certain subalgebras of the Chow ring. Beauville proves the invariance of his conjecture under elementary Mukai flops. By means of Theorem 2.6, we extend this to:

Proposition 3.3. *The conjectures of Beauville and Voisin are both invariant under birational correspondences satisfying condition* (†).

The most fundamental examples of birational correspondences between irreducible symplectic varieties X and X' are provided by general Mukai flops. In this case one can fix families $\mathscr{X}$ and $\mathscr{X}'$ as above and explicitly determine Z. Thus computing the action of $[Z]_*$ provides an alternative approach to Theorem 2.6. In order to demonstrate that even in this fundamental case the result

---

Funded by the SFB/TR 45 ‘Periods, moduli spaces and arithmetic of algebraic varieties’ of the DFG (German Research Foundation)

is non-trivial, we will show the multiplicativity of $[Z]_*$ in this case by explicit computations. This will take up all of Sections 4 and 5.

Still in the case of general Mukai flops, the last section relates Theorem 2.6 to a known result on derived categories and Grothendieck groups. Namikawa proved that the Fourier–Mukai transform $\Phi_{\mathcal{O}_Z} : \mathrm{D}^b(X) \to \mathrm{D}^b(X')$ is an equivalence of categories (cf. [Nam03, Theorem 5.1]). We show that the induced map $\Phi^{\mathrm{CH}}_{v(\mathcal{O}_Z)} : \mathrm{CH}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) \to \mathrm{CH}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X')$ coincides with $[Z]_*$ and thus deduce that $\Phi^K_{[\mathcal{O}_Z]} : K(X) \otimes \mathbb{Q} \to K(X') \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ is an isomorphism of graded rings. Note that this multiplicativity is not reflected on the level of derived categories, since $\Phi_{\mathcal{O}_Z}$ is not compatible with the derived tensor product (cf. [Bal02]).

Acknowledgements. I wish to thank my advisor Daniel Huybrechts for his support. Sections 4 and 5 are part of the authors diploma thesis.

2. Main theorem

In this section we state and prove Theorem 2.6, which is the main result of this article.

2.1. **Notation and formulation of the theorem.** Throughout the article we will denote by $\mathrm{CH}(X)$ the Chow ring (with integral coefficients) of a nonsingular quasi-projective complex variety X, whereas the Chow ring with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}$ will be denoted by $\mathrm{CH}_{\mathbb{Q}}$. By "complex variety" we refer to a separated integral scheme of finite type over $\mathbb{C}$.

Consider two birational irreducible symplectic varieties X and X'. We say X and X' satisfy the condition (†), if the following holds:

(†) The varieties X and X' are either connected by a general Mukai flop (cf. Section 5.1) or isomorphic in codimension two (i.e. there exist isomorphic open subsets $U \subseteq X$ and $U' \subseteq X'$ with $\mathrm{codim}_X(X \setminus U)$, $\mathrm{codim}_{X'}(X' \setminus U') \geq 3$).

Remark 2.1. We emphasize that this is a rather weak condition. In fact, every birational correspondence is expected to be a composition of general Mukai flops in codimension two and birational correspondences which are isomorphisms in codimension two.

The following proposition is an algebraic version of [Huy97, Theorem 3.4 + Theorem 4.7]. It is essential for many of the proofs.

Proposition 2.2. *Let X and X' satisfy the condition (†). Then there exist algebraic varieties $\mathscr{X}$ and $\mathscr{X}'$ over T (T smooth quasi-projective one-dimensional variety), and a closed point $0 \in T$ such that*

(a) $\mathscr{X}_0 = X$ and $\mathscr{X}'_0 = X'$, and
(b) there is an isomorphism $\Psi : \mathscr{X}_{T\setminus\{0\}} \cong \mathscr{X}'_{T\setminus\{0\}}$ over to T.

The original proofs for [Huy97, Theorem 3.4] and [Huy97, Theorem 4.7] can be adapted to the algebraic setting.

Remark 2.3. In the following, any statement we formulate for X and X' satisfying (†) is in fact already true under the condition that families $\mathscr{X}$ and $\mathscr{X}'$ as in Proposition 2.2 exist.

Remark 2.4. In the non-algebraic setting the condition (†) can be dropped (cf. [Huy99, Theorem 4.6]). However, the proof is not applicable to the algebraic setting.

Fix the following notation for the rest of the article:

Notation. Denote the generic point of T by η. The generic fibres of $\mathscr{X}$ and $\mathscr{X}'$ are consequently denoted by $\mathscr{X}_\eta$ and $\mathscr{X}'_\eta$ respectively. Then Ψ restricts to an isomorphism $\psi : \mathscr{X}_\eta \to \mathscr{X}'_\eta$. Let Γ be the graph of ψ, and $\overline{\Gamma} \subseteq \mathscr{X} \times_T \mathscr{X}'$ be its closure. Finally, define $Z \subseteq X \times X'$ as the special fibre of $\overline{\Gamma}$ and denote the associated class in $\mathrm{CH}(X \times X')$ by $[Z]$.

Let q and q' be the projections from $X \times X'$ to X and X' respectively.

Definition 2.5. Define $[Z]_* : \mathrm{CH}(X) \to \mathrm{CH}(X')$ as the correspondence with kernel $[Z]$, i.e. as the map given by $[Z]_*(\alpha) := q'_*([Z].q^*\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in \mathrm{CH}(X)$.

We can now state the main result of this article, which is new even for the case of elementary Mukai flops:

Theorem 2.6. *Let X and X' be birational irreducible symplectic varieties satisfying the condition (†). Then the map $[Z]_* : \mathrm{CH}(X) \to \mathrm{CH}(X')$ is an isomorphism of graded rings. Its inverse is the correspondence $[Z]'_* : \mathrm{CH}(X') \to \mathrm{CH}(X)$ with kernel $[Z]$ in the opposite direction.*

The proof of this theorem is given in Section 2.4.

Remark 2.7. It should be possible to prove Theorem 2.6 without assuming (†) by working with the generic fibre of a formal deformations as in [HMS11]. However, as it is expected that every birational correspondence is either an isomorphism in codimension two or described by a general Mukai flop, we refrain from doing this.

Instead of Z, one could consider $\overline{\Delta} \subseteq X \times X'$, where Δ is the graph of a birational isomorphism. However, the map $\left[\overline{\Delta}\right]_*$ is not multiplicative in general.

2.2. **Theorem 2.6 in cohomology.** Before proving Theorem 2.6, we discuss the analogous statement in cohomology.

For the purpose of this subsection it is enough to work in the more general setting of (not necessarily projective) complex manifolds.

Let X and X' be birational compact hyperkähler manifolds. Then by [Huy03, Theorem 2.5] there exist deforming families of complex manifolds $\mathscr{X}$ and $\mathscr{X}'$ satisfying the conditions of Proposition 2.2. Define Z as above and let $[Z] \in H^*(X \times X')$ be the cohomology class of the analytic cycle Z. This induces a correspondence $[Z]^H_* : H^*(X, \mathbb{Z}) \to H^*(X', \mathbb{Z})$. The analogous statement to Theorem 2.6 on the level of cohomology is:

Lemma 2.8 (cf. [Huy03, Corollary 2.7])**.** *The map $[Z]^H_* : H^*(X, \mathbb{Z}) \to H^*(X', \mathbb{Z})$ is an isomorphism of graded rings.*

Proof. This follows from Ehresmann's Theorem (see e.g. [Voi07, Theorem 9.3]), since the cycle $[Z]$ is by definition the limit cycle of the graphs of the isomorphisms $\mathscr{X}_t \cong \mathscr{X}'_t$ for $t \neq 0$. □

2.3. **The specialization map.** Let us fix the notation for the specialization maps. Let T be a smooth quasi-projective one-dimensional variety and η be its generic point. Let $\pi : \mathscr{Y} \to T$ be a smooth morphism of varieties. Fix $t \in T$. There is a commutative triangle:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& \mathrm{CH}(\mathscr{Y}) \arrow[dl, "r_\eta"'] \arrow[dr, "s_t"] & \\
\mathrm{CH}(\mathscr{Y}_\eta) \arrow[rr, "\sigma"] & & \mathrm{CH}(\mathscr{Y}_t)\,,
\end{tikzcd}$$

where s_t denotes the restriction to $\mathscr{Y}_t$ (which coincides with the specialization map of [Ful84, Chapter 10.1]). On the level of cycles, r_η is defined as the restriction to the generic fibre and σ as the composition of taking the closure in $\mathscr{Y}$ and restriction to $\mathscr{Y}_t$. The map σ is called *specialization map*. Commutativity of the triangle and compatibility of r_η and σ with rational equivalence may be checked explicitly.

All three maps are compatible with the intersection product, pull-back, proper push-forward, and taking Chern classes.

By slight abuse of notation, we will not keep the family $\mathscr{Y}$ in the notation, but use the symbols r_η, s_t, and σ for various families.

2.4. **Proof of Theorem 2.6.** In order to prove the theorem, one needs to show:

- *(Compatibility with graduation):* The map $[Z]_*$ respects the grading of the Chow rings, i.e. $[Z]_*\big(\mathrm{CH}^k(X)\big) \subseteq \mathrm{CH}^k(X')$.
- *(Invertibility):* The maps $[Z]_*$ and $[Z]'_*$ are inverse.
- *(Multiplicativity):* The map $[Z]_*$ is multiplicative, i.e. for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathrm{CH}(X)$ the equality $[Z]_*(\alpha).[Z]_*(\beta) = [Z]_*(\alpha.\beta)$ holds.

The compatibility with the graduation follows from the fact, that Z is of pure dimension $\dim(X)$.

Proof of invertibility. By symmetry of the situation, we only need to show that $[Z]'_* \circ [Z]_* = \mathrm{id}$. The map $[Z]'_* \circ [Z]_*$ is the correspondence with kernel $\alpha_0 := \mathrm{pr}_{XX*}\big([Z \times X].[X \times Z]\big) \in \mathrm{CH}(X \times X)$, where $\mathrm{pr}_{XX} : \mathrm{CH}(X \times X' \times X) \to \mathrm{CH}(X \times X)$ is the projection to the first and third factor (cf. [Ful84, Section 16.1]). We will show that $\alpha_0 = [\Delta_X]$, using the existence of families as in Proposition 2.2 and the specialization map (cf. Section 2.3).

Let $\mathscr{X}$ and $\mathscr{X}'$ be families as in Proposition 2.2 and keep the notation of Section 2.1. Consider the cycle

$$\alpha := \mathrm{pr}_{\mathscr{X}\mathscr{X}*}\big([\overline{\Gamma} \times_T \mathscr{X}].[\mathscr{X} \times_T \overline{\Gamma}]\big) \in \mathrm{CH}(\mathscr{X} \times_T \mathscr{X}).$$

Its restriction to the generic fibre is $\alpha_\eta := r_\eta(\alpha) = \mathrm{pr}_{\mathscr{X}_\eta \mathscr{X}_\eta *}\big([\Gamma \times_{k(\eta)} \mathscr{X}_\eta].[\mathscr{X}_\eta \times_{k(\eta)} \Gamma]\big) \in \mathrm{CH}(\mathscr{X}_\eta \times_{k(\eta)} \mathscr{X}_\eta)$. Using the fact that Γ is the graph of an isomorphism, this can explicitly be determined as: $\alpha_\eta = [\Delta_{\mathscr{X}_\eta}]$.

Since, moreover, the restriction of α to the special fibre is $s_0(\alpha) = \alpha_0$, this allows us to conclude:

$$\alpha_0 = s_0(\alpha) = \sigma(\alpha_\eta) = \sigma([\Delta_{\mathscr{X}_\eta}]) = [\Delta_X],$$

thus proving the invertibility of $[Z]_*$.

Proof of multiplicativity. Let $\Delta_3 \subseteq X \times X \times X$ be the small diagonal, i.e. the image of the natural inclusion $X \hookrightarrow X \times X \times X$ and denote the small diagonal in $X' \times X' \times X'$ by Δ'_3. Consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{CH}(X) \times \mathrm{CH}(X) \arrow[r, "{[Z]_* \times [Z]_*}"] \arrow[d, "\times"'] & \mathrm{CH}(X') \times \mathrm{CH}(X') \arrow[d, "\times"] \\
\mathrm{CH}(X \times X) \arrow[r, "{[Z \times Z]_*}"] \arrow[d, "{[\Delta_3]_*}"'] & \mathrm{CH}(X' \times X') \arrow[d, "{[\Delta'_3]_*}"] \\
\mathrm{CH}(X) \arrow[r, "{[Z]_*}"] & \mathrm{CH}(X') .
\end{tikzcd}$$

We will show the following:

(a) The composition $[\Delta_3]_* \circ \times$ coincides with the multiplication and the same holds for $[\Delta'_3]_* \circ \times$,
(b) the upper rectangle is commutative, and
(c) also the lower rectangle is commutative.

Together, this proves the proposition.

Proof of (a). Since the correspondence with kernel $[\Delta_3]$ is just pulling back to the diagonal, this follows from the reduction to the diagonal (see [Har77, p. 427]). This also holds for $[\Delta'_3]_* \circ \times$.

Proof of (b). Use functoriality of $\times$ (see [Ful84, Proposition 1.10]) to check this explicitly.

Proof of (c). We will apply similar methods as for the proof of the invertibility of $[Z]_*$. Let $p_{124} : X \times X \times X \times X' \to X \times X \times X'$ be the projection to the first, second, and fourth factor, and $p_{125} : X \times X \times X' \times X' \times X' \to X \times X \times X'$ be the projection to the first, second and fifth factor. Then $[Z]_* \circ [\Delta_3]_*$ is the correspondence with kernel $\alpha_0 := p_{124*}\big([\Delta_3 \times X'].[X \times X \times Z]\big)$ (see [Ful84, Chapter 16.1]), and analogously $[\Delta'_3]_* \circ [Z \times Z]_*$ is the correspondence with kernel $\beta_0 := p_{125*}\big([Z \times Z \times X'].[X \times X \times \Delta'_3]\big)$.

Consider families $\mathscr{X}$ and $\mathscr{X}'$ as in Proposition 2.2, and keep the notation of Section 2.1. Denote by $\overline{\Delta_{\eta 3}}$ the small diagonal in $\mathscr{X} \times_T \mathscr{X} \times_T \mathscr{X}$ and by $\overline{\Delta'_{\eta 3}}$ the small diagonal in $\mathscr{X}' \times_T \mathscr{X}' \times_T \mathscr{X}'$. Then α_0 is the specialization of the cycle $\alpha := p_{124*}\big([\overline{\Delta_{\eta 3}} \times_T \mathscr{X}'].[\mathscr{X} \times_T \mathscr{X} \times_T \overline{\Gamma}]\big)$ and β_0 is the specialization of the cycle $\beta := p_{125*}\big([\overline{\Gamma} \times_T \overline{\Gamma} \times_T \mathscr{X}].[\mathscr{X} \times_T \mathscr{X} \times_T \overline{\Delta'_{\eta 3}}]\big)$. Here, p_{124} and p_{125} are similar as before.

It is thus enough to show that $r_\eta(\alpha)$ coincides with $r_\eta(\beta)$. Let Σ be the image of the map $\mathscr{X}_\eta \to \mathscr{X}_\eta \times_{k(\eta)} \mathscr{X}_\eta \times_{k(\eta)} \mathscr{X}'_\eta$, which is induced by the identity in the first two factors and the isomorphism $\mathscr{X}_\eta \cong \mathscr{X}'_\eta$ in the last factor. Observe that:

$$\begin{aligned} r_\eta(\alpha) &= p_{124*}\big([\Delta_{\eta 3} \times_{k(\eta)} \mathscr{X}'_\eta].[\mathscr{X}_\eta \times_{k(\eta)} \mathscr{X}_\eta \times_{k(\eta)} \Gamma]\big) \\ &= [\Sigma] = p_{125*}\big([\Gamma \times_{k(\eta)} \Gamma \times_{k(\eta)} \mathscr{X}_\eta].[\mathscr{X}_\eta \times_{k(\eta)} \mathscr{X}_\eta \times_{k(\eta)} \Delta'_{\eta 3}]\big) \\ &= r_\eta(\beta). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of multiplicativity and thus the proof of Theorem 2.6. □

3. FIRST APPLICATIONS

In this section we give first applications of Theorem 2.6: We relate it to the conjectural Bloch–Beilinson filtration and apply it to Beauville's conjecture on the weak splitting property and Voisin's generalization.

Throughout this section, we will always work with the rational Chow rings $\mathrm{CH}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X)$.

3.1. Application to the Bloch–Beilinson filtration.

In contrast to the cohomology ring of a variety, the Chow ring is not well understood. While the Hodge conjecture predicts the image of the cycle class map

$$c_X : \mathrm{CH}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) \to H^*(X, \mathbb{Q}),$$

its kernel is still rather mysterious.

The Bloch–Beilinson conjecture predicts for arbitrary smooth projective X the existence of a descending filtration

$$\mathrm{CH}^k_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = F^0 \,\mathrm{CH}^k_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) \supseteq \ldots \supseteq F^{k+1} \,\mathrm{CH}^k_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = 0\,,$$

which is functorial, compatible with multiplication, and satisfies $F^1 \,\mathrm{CH}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = \ker(c_X)$. There are various candidates for such a filtration. For a discussion of this topic we refer to [Jan94, p. 245 ff.].

Now consider X and X' satisfying the condition (†) (see Section 2.1) and a functorial candidate F^i for the filtration. As an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.6, one observes $F^i \,\mathrm{CH}^k_{\mathbb{Q}}(X') = [Z]_*\big(F^i \,\mathrm{CH}^k_{\mathbb{Q}}(X)\big)$. In particular, $F^{k+1} \,\mathrm{CH}^k_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = 0$ if and only if $F^{k+1} \,\mathrm{CH}^k_{\mathbb{Q}}(X') = 0$.

3.2. Application to conjectures of Beauville and Voisin.

The original motivation for this article was to generalize [Bea07, Proposition 2.6]. In this subsection we present such a generalization deducing it from our previous results.

Let X be a nonsingular complex projective variety. In [Bea07] Beauville defines $\mathrm{DCH}(X) \subseteq \mathrm{CH}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X)$ as the subalgebra generated by divisor classes. Then X satisfies the *weak splitting property* if the restriction of the cycle class map to

$$\mathrm{DCH}(X) \hookrightarrow H^*(X, \mathbb{Q})$$

is injective. This notion was inspired by the fact that for a simply connected X the weak splitting property is satisfied, if its Bloch–Beilinson filtration *splits* (i.e. comes from a ring graduation $F^p \,\mathrm{CH}^k_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) = \bigoplus_{j=p}^k \tilde{F}^j \,\mathrm{CH}^k_{\mathbb{Q}}(X)$).

Beauville formulates the following conjecture:

Conjecture 3.1 ([Bea07]). *An irreducible symplectic projective variety satisfies the weak splitting property.*

A stronger version of this conjecture was formulated by Voisin in [Voi08]: Define $R(X) \subseteq \mathrm{CH}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X)$ as the subalgebra generated by $\mathrm{CH}^1_{\mathbb{Q}}(X)$ together with $\{c_i(T_X)\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$.

Conjecture 3.2 ([Voi08, Conjecture 0.3]). *For any irreducible symplectic complex variety X the restriction $c_X\big|_{R(X)} : R(X) \hookrightarrow H^*(X, \mathbb{Q})$ of the cycle class map to the subalgebra $R(X)$ is injective.*

For K3 surfaces S the subalgebras $\mathrm{DCH}(S)$ and $R(S)$ coincide, and the conjectures are known to be true in this case (see [BV04]).

Furthermore, Beauville proves in [Bea07] that for any K3 surface S the Hilbert schemes $\mathrm{Hilb}^2(S)$ and $\mathrm{Hilb}^3(S)$ satisfy the weak splitting property. In [Voi08], Voisin extends this result by showing that $\mathrm{Hilb}^n(S)$ already satisfies Conjecture 3.2, if $n \leq 2\, b_2(S)_{tr} + 4$. Here, $b_2(S)_{tr}$ denotes the rank of the transcendental lattice of S.

Beauville shows ([Bea07, Proposition 2.6]) that the weak splitting property is invariant under elementary Mukai flops (cf. Section 5.1). By means of Theorem 2.6, we can generalize this to more general birational correspondences satisfying (†) on the one hand, and to the more general conjecture of Voisin on the other hand. At the same time, the proof below is simpler than the one in [Bea07], as it does not make any use of the multiplicative structure of the cohomology of an irreducible symplectic variety.

Proposition 3.3. *Conjecture 3.1 and Conjecture 3.2 are both invariant under birational correspondences satisfying condition* (†) *(see Section 2.1); i.e. for X and X' satisfying condition* (†)*, the restriction $c_X\big|_{\mathrm{DCH}(X)}$ is injective if and only if $c_{X'}\big|_{\mathrm{DCH}(X')}$ is, and the same holds for $c_X\big|_{R(X)}$.*

The following facts will be useful for the proof:

Lemma 3.4. *If X and X' satisfy condition* (†)*, then $[Z]_*\big(c_i(T_X)\big) = c_i(T_{X'})$ for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Let once again $\mathscr{X}$ and $\mathscr{X}'$ be families as in Proposition 2.2 and keep the notation of Section 2.1. Consider the cycle $\alpha := [\overline{\Gamma}]_*\big(c_i(T_{\mathscr{X}|T})\big) \in \mathrm{CH}(\mathscr{X}')$. Its restriction to the special fibre is $[Z]_*\big(c_i(T_{X'})\big)$. Now, one only needs to observe:

$$\alpha_\eta := r_\eta(\alpha) = [\Gamma]_*\big(c_i(T_{X_\eta|k(\eta)})\big) = c_i(T_{X'_\eta|k(\eta)}).$$

Application of the specialization map concludes the proof. □

For later use, note that this immediately implies:

Corollary 3.5. *If X and X' satisfy condition* (†)*, then $[Z]_*\big(\mathrm{td}(X)\big) = \mathrm{td}(X')$.* □

Lemma 3.6. *Let X and X' satisfy condition* (†)*. Then $[Z]_*$ restricts to isomorphisms $[Z]_* : \mathrm{DCH}(X) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{DCH}(X')$ and $[Z]_* : R(X) \xrightarrow{\cong} R(X')$.*

Proof. The first part is an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.6. The second part follows from Lemma 3.4. □

Proof of Proposition 3.3. The isomorphisms of Lemma 3.6 complete the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{DCH}(X) \arrow[r, "\cong"] \arrow[d, hook] & \mathrm{DCH}(X') \arrow[d, hook] \\
R(X) \arrow[r, "\cong"] \arrow[d, hook] & R(X') \arrow[d, hook] \\
\mathrm{CH}(X) \arrow[r, "\cong", "{[Z]_*}"'] \arrow[d, "c_X"'] & \mathrm{CH}(X') \arrow[d, "c_{X'}"] \\
H^*(X,\mathbb{Q}) \arrow[r, "\cong", "{[Z]_*^H}"'] & H^*(X',\mathbb{Q})\ .
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proposition 3.3 follows immediately. □

4. General facts on Chow rings

For most of the rest of the article, we will present an alternative proof for the multiplicativity of $[Z]_*$ in the case of general Mukai flops. In this special case, one can make explicit calculations in the Chow rings. While it is interesting to see that it can be done, the proof is much more intricate without the use of families as in Proposition 2.2. This indicates that even for these most fundamental examples of birational transforms between irreducible symplectic varieties, Theorem 2.6 is a non-trivial result.

For the convenience of the reader and to fix notations we recall some standard results on Chow rings of projective bundles and blow-ups in this section. All results can be found in or deduced from [Ful84].

4.1. **On the Chow ring of projective bundles.**

This subsection recalls statements on the Chow rings of projective bundles. In particular, we express the Chern classes of their relative cotangent bundle explicitly.

Let S be a nonsingular quasi-projective complex variety, F a locally free sheaf on S, and $\pi : \mathbb{P}(F) := \mathbb{P}\mathrm{roj}\,\big(\mathrm{Sym}(F^\vee)\big) \to S$ the natural proper projection.

Lemma 4.1. *The Chern classes of the relative cotangent bundle of* $\mathbb{P}(F)$ *are given by the following formula:*

$$c_i(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}(F)|S}) = (-1)^i \sum_{j=0}^{i} \binom{\mathrm{rk}\,(F)-j}{i-j} \pi^*(c_j(F)).\big(c_1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F)}(1))\big)^{i-j}.$$

Proof. Use the Euler sequence:

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}(F)|S} \longrightarrow \pi^*(F^\vee)(-1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F)} \longrightarrow 0, \tag{4.1}$$

and multiplicativity of Chern polynomials ($c_t(\mathscr{F}) := \sum c_i(\mathscr{F})\, t^i$) to get

$$c_t(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}(F)|S}) = c_t\big(\pi^*(F^\vee) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F)}(-1)\big).$$

Then use that for any line bundle $\mathscr{L}$:

$$c_i(\mathscr{F} \otimes \mathscr{L}) = \sum_{j=0}^{i} \binom{\mathrm{rk}\,(\mathscr{F})-j}{i-j} c_j(\mathscr{F}).\big(c_1(\mathscr{L})\big)^{i-j} \tag{4.2}$$

(see [Ful84, Example 3.2.2]). □

The following fact will be needed several times.

Lemma 4.2. *Let still* $\pi : \mathbb{P}(F) \to S$ *be a projective bundle over* S *and* $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F)}(1)$ *be its relative* $\mathcal{O}(1)$ *with respect to the bundle structure* F*. Then:*

$$\pi_*\Big(\big(c_1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F)}(1))\big)^k\Big) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } k < \mathrm{rk}(F)-1 \\ 1_S & \text{for } k = \mathrm{rk}(F)-1 \\ -c_1(F) & \text{for } k = \mathrm{rk}(F) \end{cases}.$$

Proof. The statement for $k < \mathrm{rk}(F) - 1$ holds because $\mathrm{CH}^{k-\mathrm{rk}(F)+1}(S) = 0$.

For $k = \mathrm{rk}(F) - 1$, by definition of the Segre class it is enough to show $1_S = s_0(F) \cap 1_S$. This follows from [Ful84, Proposition 3.1.(a).(ii)].

Finally the case $k = \mathrm{rk}(F)$ follows from the previous ones, by applying π_* to the following identity (c.f. [Ful84, Remark 3.2.4] together with [Ful84, Theorem 3.2.d]):

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\mathrm{rk}(F)} \pi^* c_i(F).\big(c_1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F)}(1))\big)^{\mathrm{rk}(F)-i} = 0.$$

□

In the later calculation an explicit expression for still another Chern class is needed:

Lemma 4.3. *The following equality holds:*

$$c_i\big(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}(F)|S} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F)}(1)\big) = \sum_{m=0}^{i} (-1)^m c_1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F)}(1))^m.\pi^*\big(c_{i-m}(F^\vee)\big).$$

Proof. The proof is an application of (4.2), Lemma 4.1 and the following result on binomial coefficients: ☐

Claim 4.4. *Fix $r \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $0 \leq k \leq i \leq r$, the following identity holds:*

$$\sum_{j=k}^{i} (-1)^{j+k} \binom{r-j}{i-j} \binom{r+1-k}{j-k} = (-1)^{i+k}.$$

Proof. Introduce a notation for the left hand side:

$$T^r_{i,k} := \sum_{j=k}^{i} (-1)^{j+k} \binom{r-j}{i-j} \binom{r+1-k}{j-k}.$$

Then check directly that $T^r_{r,k} = (-1)^{r+k}$. To conclude the proof it is enough to show that for $i < r$ the equality $T^r_{i+1,k+1} = T^r_{i,k}$ holds. This can be done by a computation, using the relations between binomial coefficients several times. ☐

4.2. **On the Chow ring of a blow-up.** Let X be a nonsingular quasi-projective complex variety. Furthermore, let P be a closed subvariety of codimension r in X, which is also nonsingular. Let the following be the diagram of a blow-up:

$$\begin{tikzcd} E \arrow[r, hook, "j"] \arrow[d, "\eta"'] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\times"] & \hat{\mathrm{X}} \arrow[d, "\varphi"] \\ P \arrow[r, hook, "i"] & X \end{tikzcd}$$

In this situation the blow-up $\hat{\mathrm{X}}$ of X along P is known to be nonsingular and the exceptional divisor E is isomorphic to $\mathbb{P}(N_{P|X})$. Let $\mathscr{W} := \eta^*(N_{P|X})/\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(N_{P|X})}(-1)$.

The following proposition provides the most important facts on the Chow ring of a blow-up. For proof see [Ful84, Proposition 6.7].

Proposition 4.5. *With the notation introduced above:*

(a) (Key Formula). For all $\gamma \in \mathrm{CH}(P)$,

$$\varphi^* i_*(\gamma) = j_*\big(c_{r-1}(\mathscr{W}).\eta^*(\gamma)\big)$$

in $\mathrm{CH}(\hat{X})$.

(b) For all $\alpha \in \mathrm{CH}(X)$, $\varphi_*\varphi^*(\alpha) = \alpha$.

(c) If $\varepsilon \in \mathrm{CH}(E)$ and $\eta_*(\varepsilon) = 0 = j^*j_*(\varepsilon)$, then $\varepsilon = 0$.

(d) There is a split exact sequence of abelian groups:

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{CH}(P) \xrightarrow{f} \mathrm{CH}(E) \oplus \mathrm{CH}(X) \xrightarrow{g} \mathrm{CH}(\hat{\mathrm{X}}) \longrightarrow 0$$

with $f(\gamma) = \big(c_{r-1}(\mathscr{W}).\eta^*(\gamma), -i_*(\gamma)\big)$ and $g(\varepsilon, \alpha) = j_*(\varepsilon) + \varphi^*(\alpha)$. A left inverse for f is given by $(\varepsilon, \alpha) \mapsto \eta_*(\varepsilon)$.

Furthermore, the following lemmas will be used in later proofs.

Lemma 4.6. *One has $\eta_*\big(c_{r-1}(\mathscr{W})\big) = 1_P$.*

Proof. Applying Lemma 4.3 to $\mathscr{W} \cong \big(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}(N_{P|X})|P} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(N_{P|X})}(1)\big)^\vee$ yields the equality

$$c_{r-1}(\mathscr{W}) = (-1)^{r-1} \sum_{m=0}^{r-1} (-1)^m \Big(c_1\big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(N_{P|X})}(1)\big)\Big)^m .\eta^*\big(c_{r-1-m}(N_{P|X}{}^\vee)\big)\,. \tag{4.3}$$

The result thus follows by Lemma 4.2. ☐

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\hat{\alpha} \in \mathrm{CH}(\hat{\mathrm{X}})$ with $\varphi_*(\hat{\alpha}) = 0$. Then there exists a unique element $\varepsilon \in \mathrm{CH}(E)$ satisfying $\hat{\alpha} = j_*(\varepsilon)$ and $\eta_*(\varepsilon) = 0$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.5.d there exist elements $\varepsilon' \in \mathrm{CH}(E)$ and $\alpha \in \mathrm{CH}(X)$ with $\hat{\alpha} = j_*\varepsilon' + \varphi^*\alpha$. Applying φ_*, one obtains: $\varphi_*(\hat{\alpha}) = \varphi_*(j_*\varepsilon' + \varphi^*\alpha) = \varphi_* j_*\varepsilon' + \varphi_*\varphi^*\alpha \overset{4.5.\mathrm{b}}{=} i_*\eta_*\varepsilon' + \alpha$.

By assumption, $\varphi_*(\hat{\alpha}) = 0$ and therefore $\alpha = i_*\eta_*(-\varepsilon')$. One obtains:

$$\varphi^*(\alpha) = \varphi^* i_*\eta_*(-\varepsilon') \overset{4.5.\mathrm{a}}{=} j_*\Big(c_{r-1}(\mathscr{W}).\eta^*\big(\eta_*(-\varepsilon')\big)\Big). \tag{4.4}$$

Set $\varepsilon := \varepsilon' - \big(c_{r-1}(\mathscr{W}).\eta^*(\eta_*(\varepsilon'))\big)$. Then $\hat{\alpha} = j_*\varepsilon' + \varphi^*\alpha \overset{(4.4)}{=} j_*(\varepsilon)$ and

$$\eta_*(\varepsilon) \overset{(\mathrm{PF})}{=} \eta_*(\varepsilon') - \eta_*\big(c_{r-1}(\mathscr{W})\big).\eta_*(\varepsilon') \overset{4.6}{=} 0,$$

where "(PF)" denotes application of the projection formula, as it will always do in this article. Proposition 4.5.c gives the uniqueness of ε. ☐

5. Multiplicativity of $[Z]_*$ for general Mukai flops

The aim of this section is to prove in a more explicit way that for a general Mukai flop the map $[Z]_*$ is multiplicative (see Proposition 5.6). In the first part of this section, we will briefly recall the construction of a Mukai flop in order to fix the notation. After further preparation, we will present the alternative proof of Proposition 5.6 in Section 5.3.

5.1. **Mukai flops: Notation and basic facts.** In this subsection we outline the construction of a Mukai flop (as introduced in [Muk84]) in order to fix notation for the rest of the article. Furthermore we recall some standard facts for future reference.

Let X be an irreducible symplectic variety and σ a non-degenerated two-form generating $H^0(X, \Omega_X^2)$. Let $P \subseteq X$ be a nonsingular closed subvariety of codimension r, which is a $\mathbb{P}^r$-bundle, i.e. $P \cong \mathbb{P}(F) \xrightarrow{\pi} S$ for some nonsingular complex projective variety S and a vector bundle F of rank $r+1$ on S.

Define $\hat{\mathrm{X}}$ as the blow-up of X along P. Let E denote its exceptional divisor. Set furthermore $P' := \mathbb{P}(F^\vee)$.

Since in this situation $\Omega_{P|S} \cong N_{P|X}$, there is an isomorphism between E and $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{P|S})$ which on the other hand is isomorphic to the incidence variety $W := \{(l,\lambda) \,|\, l \in \lambda\} \subseteq \mathbb{P}(F) \times_S \mathbb{P}(F^\vee)$. Clearly:

Lemma 5.1.
(1) Via the isomorphism $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}(F)|S}) \cong W$, *the bundle* $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}(F)|S})}(1)$ *corresponds to*

$$\mathrm{pr}_P^*\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F)}(1)\right) \otimes \mathrm{pr}_{P'}^*\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F^\vee)}(1)\right).$$

(2) The normal bundle $N_{E|\hat{\mathrm{X}}}$ *corresponds to* $\mathrm{pr}_P^*\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F)}(-1)\right) \otimes \mathrm{pr}_{P'}^*\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F^\vee)}(-1)\right)$ *via* $E \cong W$.

Since the situation is symmetric in P and P' one can apply [Art70, Corollary 6.11] to see that a blow-down of $\hat{\mathrm{X}}$ along $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{\mathbb{P}(F^\vee)|S}) \to P'$ exists in the category of algebraic spaces.

Definition 5.2. If X' is once again a projective variety, $X \leftarrow \hat{\mathrm{X}} \to X'$ is called a *general Mukai flop* or just *Mukai flop*. In the special case where $P \cong \mathbb{P}^n$, the triple $X \leftarrow \hat{\mathrm{X}} \to X'$ is called *elementary Mukai flop*.

In this situation X' is automatically nonsingular (cf. [Nak71] and [FN72]). Furthermore, X' is again an irreducible symplectic variety and has a unique symplectic structure, which coincides with σ outside P'.

Remark 5.3. If $\dim(X) = 4$, elementary Mukai flops play a particularly important role: Any birational transform between four-dimensional irreducible symplectic varieties is a finite composition of elementary Mukai flops. This is a consequence of [Wie02, Theorem 2].

Throughout the rest of the article denote the natural maps as in the following diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & & E \arrow[ddll, "\eta"'] \arrow[d, hook, "j"] \arrow[ddrr, "\eta'"] & & \\
 & & \hat{\mathrm{X}} \arrow[dl, "\varphi"'] \arrow[dr, "\varphi'"] & & \\
P \arrow[r, hook, "i"'] & X & & X' & P' . \arrow[l, hook', "i'"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Definition 5.4. Fix the following notations:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
h := c_1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F)}(1)) & \in \mathrm{CH}(P) \ \big(= \mathrm{CH}(\mathbb{P}(F))\big), \\
l := c_1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F^\vee)}(1)) & \in \mathrm{CH}(P') \ \big(= \mathrm{CH}(\mathbb{P}(F^\vee))\big), \\
H := \eta^*(h) & \in \mathrm{CH}(E), \\
L := \eta'^*(l) & \in \mathrm{CH}(E).
\end{array}$$

Since the Chow ring $\mathrm{CH}(P)$ of the projective bundle $P \xrightarrow{\pi} S$ turns via π^* into a free $\mathrm{CH}(S)$-module with basis $1, h, ..., h^r$, we can define:

Definition 5.5. Let $\alpha \in \mathrm{CH}(X)$ and consider $i^*(\alpha) \in \mathrm{CH}(P)$. For $k = 0, 1, \dots, r$ define $\sigma_k^\alpha \in \mathrm{CH}(S)$ as the unique elements such that

$$i^*(\alpha) = \sum_{k=0}^{r} \pi^*(\sigma_k^\alpha) h^k .$$

For a general Mukai flop the families as in Proposition 2.2 can be chosen such that

$$Z = \hat{\mathrm{X}} \cup P \times_S P'. \tag{5.1}$$

This follows from the proof of [Huy97, Theorem 3.4]. From now on we will work with this Z.

We can now state the following proposition, which is part of the statement of Theorem 2.6:

Proposition 5.6. *Let $X \leftarrow \hat{\mathrm{X}} \to X'$ be a general Mukai flop. Then the map $[Z]_* : \mathrm{CH}(X) \to \mathrm{CH}(X')$ (as in Definition 2.5) is multiplicative.*

Proving this by explicit computations will take up the rest of this section.

Remark 5.7. In [Bea07, Lemma 2.7] Beauville considers an elementary Mukai flop $X \leftarrow \hat{\mathrm{X}} \to X'$, where $P \cong \mathbb{P}^r$. He states that for $\alpha \in \mathrm{CH}^1(X)$ the equality $\big([\hat{\mathrm{X}}]_*(\alpha)\big)^{r+1} = [\hat{\mathrm{X}}]_*(\alpha^{r+1})$ holds. Generalizing this lemma finally led to Proposition 5.6 and later to Theorem 2.6. Note, that already for elementary Mukai flops Proposition 5.6 is a significant generalization of Beauville's Lemma.

5.2. Basic calculations.

With the notation of Section 5.1 we will now give some lemmas which are used in the later calculations.

Lemma 5.8. *The first Chern classes of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{P|S})}(1)$ and $N_{E|\hat{\mathrm{X}}}$ may be expressed in the following way:*

$$c_1(N_{E|\hat{\mathrm{X}}}) = -H - L \qquad \text{and} \qquad c_1\big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{P|S})}(1)\big) = H + L \,.$$

By symmetry also $c_1\big(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{P'|S})}(1)\big) = H + L$.

Proof. This is a direct corollary from Lemma 5.1. □

Corollary 5.9. *The class H coincides with the first Chern class of the relative $\mathcal{O}(1)$ on E, with respect to the bundle structure $E \cong \mathbb{P}\big(\Omega_{P'|S} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F^\vee)}(1)\big)$.* □

As a consequence, H fulfils the following Chern class identity:

$$\sum_{n=0}^{r} \eta'^*\Big(c_{r-n}\big(\Omega_{P'|S} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F^\vee)}(1)\big)\Big).H^n = 0 \,. \tag{5.2}$$

Lemma 5.10. *The following identities in* $\mathrm{CH}(P')$ *hold:*

$$\eta'_*(H^k) = \eta'_*\eta^*(h^k) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } k \leq r-2 \\ 1_{X'} & \text{for } k = r-1 \\ l - \pi'^* c_1(F) & \text{for } k = r. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.8 one obtains $H = c_1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{P'|S})}(1)) - L$. The statement for $k \leq r-2$ and $k = r-1$ then follow directly from Lemma 4.2. For the case $k = r$ apply Lemma 4.1 additionally, in order to determine $c_1(\Omega_{P'|S})$. ☐

Let us now prove the following more explicit form of $[Z]_*$ (for general Mukai flops):

Lemma 5.11. *For all* $\alpha \in \mathrm{CH}(X)$*, the map* $[Z]_*$ *is given by the following formula:*

$$[Z]_*(\alpha) = \varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha) + i'_*\pi'^*(\sigma_r^\alpha)\,,$$

where $\sum_{k=0}^{r} \pi^*(\sigma_k^\alpha)h^k = i^*\alpha$ *as in Definition 5.5.*

Proof. Consider the two natural commutative diagrams:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& \hat{X} \arrow[d, hook, "\iota_{\hat{X}}"] \arrow[ddl, "\varphi"'] \arrow[ddr, "\varphi'"] & \\
& X \times X' \arrow[dl, "q"] \arrow[dr, "q'"'] & \\
X & & X'
\end{tikzcd}$$

and

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& & P \times_S P' \arrow[d, hook, "\iota_{P\times_S P'}"] \arrow[ddll, "\mathrm{pr}_P"'] \arrow[ddrr, "\mathrm{pr}_{P'}"] & & \\
& & X \times X' \arrow[dl, "q"] \arrow[dr, "q'"'] & & \\
P \arrow[r, hook, "i"'] & X & & X' & P'. \arrow[l, hook', "i'"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

One computes:

$$\begin{aligned} [Z]_*(\alpha) = q'_*([Z].q^*\alpha) &\overset{(5.1)}{=} q'_*\big(\iota_{\hat{X}*}(1_{\hat{X}}).q^*\alpha\big) + q'_*\big(\iota_{P\times_S P'*}(1_{P\times_S P'}).q^*\alpha\big) \\ &\overset{(\mathrm{PF})}{=} \varphi'_*(\varphi^*\alpha) + i'_*\mathrm{pr}_{P'*}(\mathrm{pr}_P^*\, i^*\alpha). \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

The diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
& P \times_S P' \arrow[dl, "\mathrm{pr}_P"'] \arrow[dr, "\mathrm{pr}_{P'}"] & \\
P \arrow[dr, "\pi"'] \arrow[rr, phantom, "\times"] & & P' \arrow[dl, "\pi'"] \\
& S &
\end{tikzcd}$$

is a fibre product by definition. Furthermore π and π' are both flat and proper. Given this situation, [Ful84, Proposition 1.7] states that $\mathrm{pr}_{P'*}\,\mathrm{pr}_P^* = \pi'^*\pi_*$.

Since furthermore by Lemma 4.2:

$$\pi_* h^k = \begin{cases} 1_S & \text{if } k = r \\ 0 & \text{if } k \leq r \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

(recall that in our setting $\mathrm{rk}(F) = r+1$), one obtains:

$$\mathrm{pr}_{P'*}(\mathrm{pr}_P^*\, i^*\alpha) = \pi'^*\pi_* i^*\alpha \overset{5.5}{=} \sum_{k=0}^{r} \pi'^*\pi_*(\pi^*\sigma_k^\alpha.h^k) \overset{(PF)}{=} \sum_{k=0}^{r} \pi'^*(\sigma_k^\alpha.\pi_* h^k) = \pi'^*(\sigma_r^\alpha)\,. \tag{5.5}$$

Inserting this equality into (5.3) yields:

$$[Z]_*(\alpha) \overset{(5.3)}{=} \varphi'_*(\varphi^*\alpha) + i'_*\mathrm{pr}_{P'*}(\mathrm{pr}_P^*\, i^*\alpha) = \varphi'_*\varphi^*\alpha + i'_*\pi'^*(\sigma_r^\alpha)\,,$$

which concludes the proof. ☐

At last, deduce from the self-intersection formula ([Ful84, p. 103]) that for any regular embedding $i : P \hookrightarrow X$ of codimension r between complex varieties and for any $\alpha, \beta \in \mathrm{CH}(P)$ the following formula holds:

$$i_*(\alpha).i_*(\beta) = i_*\big(\alpha.\beta.c_r(N_{P|X})\big). \tag{5.6}$$

5.3. **Proof of Proposition 5.6 (explicit version).** Note that $[Z]_*$ is additive and $[Z]_*(1_X) = 1_{X'}$. Since furthermore $[Z] \in \mathrm{CH}^{\dim X}(X \times X')$, the map $[Z]_*$ respects the grading. It is hence enough to show multiplicativity of $[Z]_*$.

The proof relies on the explicit description of the Chow rings of projective bundles. We will show that the deviation from multiplicativity of $[Z]_*$ is of the form $i'_*(\gamma)$. One such element γ can then be determined by calculations in the Chow rings of P, E, and P' and turns out to be zero.

Preparation. For $\alpha \in \mathrm{CH}(X)$ set:

$$\Delta_\alpha := \varphi'^*\varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha) - \varphi^*(\alpha)$$

and

$$E_\alpha := j^*\varphi^*(\alpha) = \eta^* i^*(\alpha)\,.$$

With this definition $\varphi'_*(\Delta_\alpha) = (\varphi'_*\varphi'^*)\varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha) - \varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha) \overset{4.5.b}{=} \varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha) - \varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha) = 0$. Therefore, Lemma 4.7 yields a unique element

$$\delta_\alpha \in \mathrm{CH}(E), \quad \text{with } \; j_*(\delta_\alpha) = \Delta_\alpha \text{ and } \eta'_*(\delta_\alpha) = 0.$$

We now start to study the map $[Z]_*$.

Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathrm{CH}(X)$. By Lemma 5.11 we know:

$$\begin{aligned} [Z]_*\alpha.[Z]_*\beta &= \big(\varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha) + i'_*(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\alpha)\big).\big(\varphi'_*\varphi^*(\beta) + i'_*(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta)\big) \\ &= \varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha).\varphi'_*\varphi^*(\beta) + \underbrace{\varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha).i'_*(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta)}_{(*)} + \underbrace{i'_*(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\alpha).\varphi'_*\varphi^*(\beta)}_{(**)} + \underbrace{i'_*(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\alpha).i'_*(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta)}_{(***)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of Δ_α and Δ_β, one obtains furthermore:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha).\varphi'_*\varphi^*(\beta) &\overset{4.5.b}{=} \varphi'_*\varphi'^*\Big(\varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha).\varphi'_*\varphi^*(\beta)\Big) = \varphi'_*\Big((\varphi^*(\alpha) + \Delta_\alpha)(\varphi^*(\beta) + \Delta_\beta)\Big) \\ &= \varphi'_*\big(\varphi^*(\alpha.\beta)\big) + \underbrace{\varphi'_*\big(\Delta_\alpha.\varphi^*(\beta)\big)}_{\text{(I)}} + \underbrace{\varphi'_*\big(\varphi^*(\alpha).\Delta_\beta\big)}_{\text{(II)}} + \underbrace{\varphi'_*\big(\Delta_\alpha.\Delta_\beta\big)}_{\text{(III)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Together, this yields:

$$\begin{aligned} [Z]_*\alpha.[Z]_*\beta &= \varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha).\varphi'_*\varphi^*(\beta) + (*) + (**) + (***) \\ &= \varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha.\beta) + \text{(I)} + \text{(II)} + \text{(III)} + (*) + (**) + (***)\,. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, $[Z]_*(\alpha.\beta)$ is (by Lemma 5.11) known to be:

$$[Z]_*(\alpha.\beta) = \varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha.\beta) + i'_*\pi'^*(\sigma_r^{\alpha.\beta}).$$

In order to prove multiplicativity of $[Z]_*$ it is hence enough to show that:

$$\text{(I)} + \text{(II)} + \text{(III)} + (*) + (**) + (***) = i'_*\pi'^*(\sigma_r^{\alpha.\beta}). \tag{5.7}$$

This will be shown by explicit calculations.

First expression for (I) + (II) + (III). Rewrite (I), (II), and (III) to see that they lie in the push forward of $\mathrm{CH}(P')$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{(I)} \;&=\; \varphi'_*\big(\Delta_\alpha.\varphi^*(\beta)\big) = \varphi'_*\big(j_*(\delta_\alpha).\varphi^*(\beta)\big) \overset{\text{(PF)}}{=} \varphi'_* j_*\big(\delta_\alpha.\underbrace{j^*\varphi^*(\beta)}_{=E_\beta}\big)\\
&\overset{5.5}{=} i'_*\eta'_*\Big(\delta_\alpha.\big(\sum_{i=0}^{r}\eta'^*\pi'^*\sigma_i^\beta.H^i\big)\Big) \overset{\text{(PF)}}{=} i'_*\big(\sum_{i=0}^{r}\pi'^*\sigma_i^\beta.\eta'_*(\delta_\alpha.H^i)\big).
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.8}
$$

Switching the roles of α and β, one obtains: (II) $= \varphi'_* j_*(E_\alpha.\delta_\beta)$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{(III)} \;&=\; \varphi'_*(\Delta_\alpha.\Delta_\beta) = \varphi'_*\Big(\big(\varphi'^*\varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha) - \varphi^*(\alpha)\big).j_*(\delta_\beta)\Big)\\
&\overset{\text{(PF)}}{=} \varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha).\underbrace{\varphi'_*\underbrace{j_*(\delta_\beta)}_{\Delta_\beta}}_{=0} - \varphi'_* j_*\big(j^*\varphi^*(\alpha).\delta_\beta\big) = -\varphi'_* j_*(E_\alpha.\delta_\beta) = -\text{(II)}\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence one obtains:

$$
\text{(I)} + \text{(II)} + \text{(III)} = \;\; \text{(I)} \overset{(5.8)}{=} i'_*\big(\sum_{i=0}^{r}\pi'^*\sigma_i^\beta.\eta'_*(\delta_\alpha.H^i)\big).
\tag{5.9}
$$

Note that this expression consist of terms of the form $i'_*\big(\xi.\eta'_*(\delta_\alpha.H^i)\big)$, with $\xi \in \mathrm{CH}(P')$.

Expression for $i'_*\big(\xi.\eta'_*(\delta_\alpha.H^i)\big)$ *independent of* δ_α. Fix a class $\xi \in \mathrm{CH}(P')$ and $0 \le j \le r$. The expression $\varphi'_*\big(\Delta_\alpha.j_*(\eta'^*\xi.H^j)\big)$ can be rewritten in two different ways.

On the one hand:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi'_*\big(\Delta_\alpha.j_*(\eta'^*\xi.H^j)\big) &= \varphi'_*\Big(\big(\varphi'^*\varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha) - \varphi^*(\alpha)\big).j_*(\eta'^*\xi.H^j)\Big)\\
&\overset{\text{(PF)}}{=} \varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha).\varphi'_*j_*(\eta'^*\xi.H^j) - \varphi'_*j_*\big(j^*\varphi^*(\alpha).\eta'^*\xi.H^j\big)\\
&= \varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha).i'_*\eta'_*(\eta'^*\xi.H^j) - i'_*\eta'_*(E_\alpha.\eta'^*\xi.H^j)\\
&\overset{\text{(PF)}}{=} \varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha).i'_*\big(\xi.\underbrace{\eta'_*(H^j)}_{=0\ \forall j\le r-2}\big) - i'_*\big(\xi.\eta'_*(E_\alpha.H^j)\big).
\end{aligned}
$$

On the other hand using (5.6) and Lemma 5.8 yields:

$$
\varphi'_*\big(\Delta_\alpha.j_*(\eta'^*\xi.H^j)\big) = \varphi'_*\big(j_*(\delta_\alpha).j_*(\eta'^*\xi.H^j)\big) = i'_*\Big(\xi.\eta'_*\big(\delta_\alpha.H^j(-H-L)\big)\Big).
$$

Together this shows:

$$
i'_*\Big(\xi.\eta'_*\big(\delta_\alpha.H^j(H+L)\big)\Big) = i'_*\big(\xi.\eta'_*(E_\alpha.H^j)\big), \qquad \forall\ 0 \le j \le r-2.
\tag{5.10}
$$

Furthermore, for $j = r-1$ the above equality becomes (using $\eta'_*(H^{r-1}) = 1_{P'}$):

$$
\varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha).i'_*\xi = i'_*\big(\xi.\eta'_*(E_\alpha.H^{r-1})\big) - i'_*\Big(\xi.\eta'_*\big(\delta_\alpha.H^{r-1}(H+L)\big)\Big).
\tag{5.11}
$$

By means of (5.10) we now prove:

Claim 5.12. *For all* $0 \le j \le r-1$ *and for all* $\xi \in \mathrm{CH}(P')$ *the following equation holds:*

$$
i'_*\big(\xi.\eta'_*(\delta_\alpha.H^j)\big) = \sum_{i=0}^{j-1}(-1)^i\ i'_*\big(\xi.l^i.\eta'_*(E_\alpha.H^{j-i-1})\big).
$$

Proof of claim. In the case $j = 0$, it is enough to recall that $\eta'_*(\delta_\alpha) = 0$ by the choice of δ_α. The full statement then follows inductively from the equation

$$i'_*\big(\xi.\eta'_*(\delta_\alpha.H^{j+1})\big) + i'_*\big(\xi.l.\eta'_*(\delta_\alpha.H^j)\big) \overset{\text{(PF)}}{=} i'_*\big(\xi.\eta'_*(\delta_\alpha.H^j(H+L))\big) \overset{(5.10)}{=} i'_*\big(\xi.\eta'_*(E_\alpha.H^j)\big)$$

which holds for $0 \le j \le r-2$. $\square_{\text{(Claim)}}$

First expressions for $(*)$, $(**)$ *and* $(***)$. We now rewrite the terms $(*)$, $(**)$ and $(***)$. The new forms will show that they are in the image of $i'_* : \mathrm{CH}(P') \to \mathrm{CH}(X')$.

Use (5.11) and Claim 5.12 to see:

$$\begin{aligned}
(*) &= \varphi'_*\varphi^*(\alpha).i'_*(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta)\\
&\overset{(5.11)}{=} i'_*\Big(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta.\eta'_*(E_\alpha.H^{r-1}) - \pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta.l.\eta'_*(\delta_\alpha.H^{r-1}) - \pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta.\eta'_*(\delta_\alpha.H^r)\Big)\\
&\overset{5.12}{=} i'_*\left(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta.\eta'_*(E_\alpha.H^{r-1}) - \pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta.\sum_{i=0}^{r-2}(-1)^i.l^{i+1}.\eta'_*(E_\alpha.H^{r-1-i-1}) - \pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta.\eta'_*(\delta_\alpha.H^r)\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= i'_*\left(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta.\sum_{i=0}^{r-1}(-1)^i.l^i.\eta'_*(E_\alpha.H^{r-i-1}) - \pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta.\eta'_*(\delta_\alpha.H^r)\right). \tag{5.12}$$

Switching α and β, one obtains the following expression for $(**)$:

$$(**) = i'_*\Big(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\alpha\sum_{i=0}^{r-1}(-1)^i.l^i.\eta'_*(E_\beta.H^{r-i-1}) - \pi'^*\sigma_r^\alpha.\eta'_*(\delta_\beta.H^r)\Big). \tag{5.13}$$

For $(***)$, application of (5.6) gives:

$$(***) = i'_*(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\alpha).i'_*(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta) = i'_*\big(\pi'^*(\sigma_r^\alpha.\sigma_r^\beta).c_r(\Omega_{P'|S})\big). \tag{5.14}$$

Notation: $\tau_{i,j}$. Apply the fact that via π^* the ring $\mathrm{CH}(P)$ is a free $\mathrm{CH}(S)$-module generated by $1, h, h^2, \dots h^r$, to make the following definition:

Definition 5.13. Let $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Define $\tau_{i,j} \in \mathrm{CH}(S)$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, r$ as the unique elements such that:

$$h^i = \sum_{j=0}^{r} \pi^*(\tau_{i,j}).h^j\ .$$

Furthermore, set $\tau_{i,j} = 0$ for all $j \notin \{0, 1, \dots, r\}$.

Remark 5.14. Note that with this definition $\tau_{i,j} = \delta_{i,j}.1_S$ for all $i \le r$, where $\delta_{i,j}$ is the Kronecker delta.

Remark 5.15. There is a recursive relation between the $\tau_{i,j}$ given by:

$$\tau_{i+1,j} = \tau_{i,j-1} - c_{r+1-j}(F)\ \tau_{i,r}\ .$$

Proof of Remark 5.15. The statement follows by comparing the coefficients in:

$$h^{i+1} = h.h^i = \sum_{j=0}^{r}\pi^*(\tau_{i,j}).h^{j+1} = \sum_{j=1}^{r}\pi^*(\tau_{i,j-1}).h^j - \sum_{j=0}^{r}\pi^*\big(\tau_{i,r}\ c_{r+1-j}(F)\big)\ h^j.$$

$\square_{\text{(Remark)}}$

Final expression for $i'_*\big(\pi'^*(\sigma_r^{\alpha.\beta})\big)$. With this notation, we can express the right hand side of (5.7) more explicitly:

$$
\begin{aligned}
i'_*\big(\pi'^*(\sigma_r^{\alpha.\beta})\big) &\overset{(5.5)}{=} i'_*\pi'^*\big(\pi_*(i^*(\alpha.\beta))\big) = i'_*\pi'^*\pi_*\Big(\big(\sum_{k=0}^{r}\pi^*(\sigma_k^\alpha).h^k\big)\big(\sum_{j=0}^{r}\pi^*(\sigma_j^\beta).h^j\big)\Big)\\
&= i'_*\pi'^*\Big(\sum_{k=0}^{r}\sum_{j=0}^{r}\sigma_k^\alpha\sigma_j^\beta\sum_{m=0}^{r}\tau_{k+j,m}.\pi_*(h^m)\Big) \overset{(5.4)}{=} i'_*\pi'^*\Big(\sum_{k=0}^{r}\sum_{j=0}^{r}\sigma_k^\alpha\sigma_j^\beta.\tau_{k+j,r}\Big).
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.15}
$$

In the sequel, we study the summands on the left hand side of (5.7).

Final expression for (I) + (II) + (III) + $(*)$. From (5.12) together with (5.9) one obtains:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\text{(I)+(II)} + \text{(III)} + (*)\\
&= i'_*\left(\sum_{j=0}^{r}\pi'^*\sigma_j^\beta.\eta'_*(\delta_\alpha.H^j)\right) + i'_*\left(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta\sum_{i=0}^{r-1}(-1)^i.l^i.\eta'_*(E_\alpha.H^{r-i-1}) - \pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta.\eta'_*(\delta_\alpha.H^r)\right)\\
&= i'_*\left(\sum_{j=0}^{r-1}\pi'^*\sigma_j^\beta.\eta'_*(\delta_\alpha.H^j) + \pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta\sum_{i=0}^{r-1}(-1)^i.l^i.\eta'_*(E_\alpha.H^{r-i-1})\right)\\
&\overset{5.12}{=} i'_*\left(\sum_{j=0}^{r-1}\pi'^*\sigma_j^\beta\sum_{i=0}^{j-1}(-1)^i.l^i.\eta'_*(E_\alpha.H^{j-i-1}) + \pi'^*\sigma_r^\beta\sum_{i=0}^{r-1}(-1)^i.l^i.\eta'_*(E_\alpha.H^{r-i-1})\right)\\
&= i'_*\left(\sum_{j=0}^{r}\pi'^*\sigma_j^\beta\sum_{i=0}^{j-1}(-1)^i.l^i.\eta'_*(E_\alpha.H^{j-i-1})\right)\\
&\overset{5.5}{=} i'_*\left(\sum_{k=0}^{r}\sum_{j=0}^{r}\pi'^*(\sigma_k^\alpha.\sigma_j^\beta)\sum_{i=0}^{j-1}(-1)^i.l^i.\eta'_*(H^{k+j-i-1})\right).
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.16}
$$

The following claim computes the sum appearing in the last line:

Claim 5.16. *For all* $j,k\in\mathbb{N}_0$ *the following equation holds:*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{j-1}(-1)^i l^i\eta'_*(H^{k+j-i-1}) = \pi'^*(\tau_{k+j,r}) + (-1)^{j-1}l^j.\pi'^*(\tau_{k,r}).$$

Proof of claim. Using the definition of the $\tau_{i,j}$, Lemma 5.10 and Remark 5.15, one computes:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=0}^{j-1}(-1)^i l^i\eta'_*(H^{k+j-i-1}) &= \sum_{i=0}^{j-1}(-1)^i l^i\eta'_*\big(\sum_{m=0}^{r}\eta'^*\pi'^*(\tau_{k+j-i-1,m}).H^m\big)\\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{j-1}(-1)^i l^i\Big(\pi'^*(\tau_{k+j-i-1,r-1}) + \pi'^*(\tau_{k+j-i-1,r})\big(l-\pi'^*c_1(F)\big)\Big)\\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{j-1}(-1)^i l^i\big(\pi'^*(\tau_{k+j-i,r}) + l.\pi'^*(\tau_{k+j-i-1,r})\big)\\
&= \pi'^*(\tau_{k+j,r}) + (-1)^{j-1}l^j.\pi'^*(\tau_{k,r}).
\end{aligned}
$$

This proves the claim. $\square_{\text{(Claim)}}$

Using this claim, one can simplify (5.16) in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathrm{I}) + (\mathrm{II}) + (\mathrm{III}) + (*) &\overset{(5.16)}{=} i'_*\Big(\sum_{k=0}^{r}\sum_{j=0}^{r} \pi'^*(\sigma_k^\alpha.\sigma_j^\beta)\sum_{i=0}^{j-1}(-1)^i.l^i.\eta'_*(H^{k+j-i-1})\Big)\\
&= i'_*\Big(\sum_{k=0}^{r}\sum_{j=0}^{r} \pi'^*(\sigma_k^\alpha.\sigma_j^\beta).\Big(\pi'^*(\tau_{k+j,r}) + (-1)^{j-1}l^j.\pi'^*(\tau_{k,r})\Big)\Big)\\
&\overset{5.14}{=} i'_*\Big(\sum_{k=0}^{r}\sum_{j=0}^{r} \pi'^*(\sigma_k^\alpha\sigma_j^\beta.\tau_{k+j,r}) + \sum_{j=0}^{r}\pi'^*(\sigma_r^\alpha.\sigma_j^\beta).(-1)^{j-1}l^j\Big). \qquad (5.17)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the first part of this term coincides with the expression obtained for $i'_*\big(\pi'^*(\sigma_r^{\alpha.\beta})\big)$ in (5.15).

Final expression for $(**)$. Recall that (5.13) gives:

$$(**) \ = i'_*\Big(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\alpha\sum_{i=0}^{r-1}(-1)^i.l^i.\eta'_*(E_\beta.H^{r-i-1}) - \pi'^*\sigma_r^\alpha.\eta'_*(\delta_\beta.H^r)\Big).$$

Let us first rewrite the second summand separately. Note that Claim 5.12 only holds for H^n with $n \leq r-1$. In order to reduce to this case, apply the Chern class identity (5.2). To shorten notation, set $\ell := \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(F')}(1)$. With this definition $c_1(\ell) = l$. Then combining Claim 5.12 and (5.2) one obtains:

$$i'_*\Big(- \pi'^*\sigma_r^\alpha.\eta'_*(\delta_\beta.H^r)\Big) = i'_*\Big(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\alpha\sum_{n=0}^{r-1}c_{r-n}(\Omega_{P'|S}\otimes\ell)\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}(-1)^i.l^i.\eta'_*(E_\beta.H^{n-i-1})\Big).$$

The left summand of (5.13) corresponds to the $(n = r)$ - part of this sum. Hence:

$$\begin{aligned}
(**) \ &= i'_*\Big(\pi'^*\sigma_r^\alpha\sum_{n=0}^{r}c_{r-n}(\Omega_{P'|S}\otimes\ell)\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}(-1)^i.l^i.\eta'_*(E_\beta.H^{n-i-1})\Big)\\
&\overset{5.5}{=} i'_*\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{r}\pi'^*(\sigma_r^\alpha.\sigma_j^\beta)\sum_{n=0}^{r}c_{r-n}(\Omega_{P'|S}\otimes\ell)\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}(-1)^i.l^i.\eta'_*(H^{j+n-i-1})\Big)\\
&\overset{5.16}{=} i'_*\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{r}\pi'^*(\sigma_r^\alpha.\sigma_j^\beta)\sum_{n=0}^{r}c_{r-n}(\Omega_{P'|S}\otimes\ell)\Big(\pi'^*(\tau_{n+j,r}) + (-1)^{n-1}l^n.\pi'^*(\tau_{j,r})\Big)\Big)\\
&\overset{5.14}{=} i'_*\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{r}\pi'^*(\sigma_r^\alpha.\sigma_j^\beta)\underbrace{\sum_{n=0}^{r}c_{r-n}(\Omega_{P'|S}\otimes\ell).\pi'^*(\tau_{n+j,r})}_{=:T_1(j)}\\
&\qquad\qquad + \pi'^*(\sigma_r^\alpha.\sigma_r^\beta)\underbrace{\sum_{n=0}^{r}(-1)^{n-1}l^n.c_{r-n}(\Omega_{P'|S}\otimes\ell)}_{=:T_2}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

We need to develop more explicit expressions for $T_1(j)$ and T_2.

Claim 5.17. *For all* $j = 0, 1, \ldots, r$ *the identity*

$$T_1(j) = (-1)^j l^j$$

holds.

Proof of claim. In fact, we will prove a slightly more general statement. We prove that for any $j, q \in \{0, 1, \ldots, r\}$ the following equality holds:

$$T_1(j, r-q) := \sum_{n=0}^{r} c_{r-n}(\Omega_{P'|S} \otimes \ell).\pi'^*(\tau_{n+j,r-q}) = (-1)^j l^j \Big(\sum_{m=0}^{q} (-1)^m l^m.\pi'^*\big(c_{q-m}(F)\big)\Big). \tag{5.18}$$

Note that $T_1(j, r) = T_1(j)$. Therefore, the statement of the claim follows from (5.18) by setting $q = 0$.

We prove (5.18) by induction on j. For $j = 0$ and one simply observes:

$$T_1(0, r-q) = \sum_{n=0}^{r} c_{r-n}(\Omega_{P'|S} \otimes \ell).\pi'^*(\tau_{n,r-q}) \overset{5.14}{=} c_q(\Omega_{P'|S} \otimes \ell) \overset{4.3}{=} \sum_{m=0}^{q} (-1)^m l^m.\pi'^*\big(c_{q-m}(F)\big).$$

For every $j \leq r-1$:

$$T_1(j+1, r-q) \overset{5.15}{=} T_1\big(j, r-(q+1)\big) - \pi'^*\big(c_{q+1}(F)\big).T_1(j, r).$$

Then application of the induction hypothesis concludes the proof. $\square_{\text{(Claim)}}$

Now determine T_2:

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 &= \sum_{n=0}^{r} (-1)^{n-1} l^n.c_{r-n}(\Omega_{P'|S} \otimes \ell) \overset{4.3}{=} \sum_{n=0}^{r} (-1)^{n-1} l^n \sum_{m=0}^{r-n} (-1)^m l^m.\pi'^*\big(c_{r-n-m}(F)\big) \\ &= \sum_{m'=0}^{r} (-1)^{m'-1}(m'+1).l^{m'}.\pi'^*\big(c_{r-m'}(F)\big). \end{aligned}$$

Using the expressions for $T_1(j)$ and T_2, one obtains:

$$\begin{aligned} (**) = i'_*\Bigg(&\sum_{j=0}^{r} \pi'^*(\sigma_r^\alpha.\sigma_j^\beta).(-1)^j l^j \\ &+ \pi'^*(\sigma_r^\alpha.\sigma_r^\beta).\sum_{m'=0}^{r} (-1)^{m'-1}(m'+1).l^{m'}.\pi'^*\big(c_{r-m'}(F)\big)\Bigg). \end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

Final expression for $(***)$. Recall that by (5.14)

$$(***) = i'_*\big(\pi'^*(\sigma_r^\alpha.\sigma_r^\beta).c_r(\Omega_{P'|S})\big).$$

Lemma 4.1 implies:

$$c_r(\Omega_{P'|S}) = \sum_{m'=0}^{r} (-1)^{m'}(m'+1).\pi'^*\big(c_{r-m'}(F)\big).l^{m'}.$$

Hence $(***)$ can be expressed as:

$$(***) = i'_*\Bigg(\pi'^*(\sigma_r^\alpha.\sigma_r^\beta).\sum_{m'=0}^{r} (-1)^{m'}(m'+1).\pi'^*\big(c_{r-m'}(F)\big).l^{m'}\Bigg). \tag{5.20}$$

Conclusion of the proof. Now combine the calculations of (I) + (II) + (III) + $(*)$, $(**)$, and $(***)$ given in (5.17), (5.19), and (5.20) respectively, to obtain:

$$\text{(I)+(II)} + \text{(III)} + (*) + (**) + (***) = i'_*\Bigg(\sum_{k=0}^{r}\sum_{j=0}^{r} \pi'^*(\sigma_k^\alpha \sigma_j^\beta.\tau_{k+j,r})\Bigg) \overset{(5.15)}{=} i'_*\big(\pi'^*(\sigma_r^{\alpha.\beta})\big).$$

By (5.7), this concludes the (alternative) proof of Proposition 5.6.

$\square$

6. Link to derived categories and Grothendieck groups

This section relates Theorem 2.6 with a result of Namikawa on derived categories ([Nam03, Theorem 5.1]). Finally, we discuss the consequence of Theorem 2.6 on the level of Grothendieck groups.

Denote by $\mathrm{D}^b(X) := \mathrm{D}^b\big(\mathbf{Coh}(X)\big)$ the bounded derived category of an algebraic variety X. For the notation and basic results on derived categories we refer to [Huy06].

Consider a general Mukai flop $X \leftarrow \hat{\mathrm{X}} \rightarrow X'$. Denote by ι_Z the natural inclusion of Z into $X \times X'$ and by q and q' the projections from $X \times X'$ to X and X' respectively.

In [Nam03] Namikawa studies the functor $\Phi_{\mathcal{O}_Z} := R(q' \circ \iota_Z)_* \circ L(q \circ \iota_Z)^* : \mathrm{D}^b(X) \to \mathrm{D}^b(X')$, which coincides with the Fourier–Mukai transform with kernel $\mathcal{O}_Z$, and proves the following result:

Theorem 6.1 ([Nam03, Theorem 5.1])**.** *For a general Mukai flop $X \leftarrow \hat{\mathrm{X}} \rightarrow X'$, the functor $\Phi_{\mathcal{O}_Z}$ is an equivalence of triangulated categories.*

For arbitrary birational irreducible symplectic varieties X and X' satisfying (†), the natural maps $\mathrm{D}^b(X) \xrightarrow{[\ ]} K(X) \xrightarrow{v} \mathrm{CH}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X)$ (where v associates to a coherent sheaf its Mukai vector $v(F) := \mathrm{ch}(F).\sqrt{\mathrm{td}(X)} \in \mathrm{CH}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X)$) give rise to the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{D}^b(X) \arrow[r, "\Phi_{\mathcal{O}_Z}"] \arrow[d, "{[\ ]}"'] & \mathrm{D}^b(X') \arrow[d, "{[\ ]}"] \\
K(X) \arrow[r, "\Phi^K_{[\mathcal{O}_Z]}"] \arrow[d, "v"'] & K(X') \arrow[d, "v"] \\
\mathrm{CH}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X) \arrow[r, "\Phi^{\mathrm{CH}}_{v(\mathcal{O}_Z)}"] & \mathrm{CH}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X').
\end{tikzcd} \tag{6.1}$$

Note that Theorem 6.1 implies bijectivity of the map $\Phi^{\mathrm{CH}}_{v(\mathcal{O}_Z)}$ in the case of general Mukai flops.

The central result of this section is:

Proposition 6.2. *Let X and X' be birational irreducible symplectic varieties satisfying* (†)*. Then the classes $v(\mathcal{O}_Z)$ and $[Z] \in \mathrm{CH}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X \times X')$ coincide. Consequently, the associated correspondences $\Phi^{\mathrm{CH}}_{v(\mathcal{O}_Z)} = [Z]_*$ are equal. In particular, $\Phi^{\mathrm{CH}}_{v(\mathcal{O}_Z)}$ is multiplicative.*

Proof. Let $\mathscr{X}$ and $\mathscr{X}'$ be families as in Proposition 2.2. Consider the following two cycles in $\mathrm{CH}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mathscr{X} \times_T \mathscr{X}')$:

(1) The cycle $\alpha := [\overline{\Gamma}]$, and
(2) the cycle $\beta := \mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{O}_{\overline{\Gamma}}).\sqrt{\mathrm{td}(T_{\mathscr{X} \times_T \mathscr{X}'|T})}$.

As a consequence of Proposition 2.2, the restriction of α to the special fibre is $s_0(\alpha) = [Z]$. On the other hand, compute:

$$\begin{aligned} s_0(\beta) &= s_0\Big(\mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{O}_{\overline{\Gamma}}).\sqrt{\mathrm{td}(T_{\mathscr{X} \times_T \mathscr{X}'|T})}\Big) = \mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{O}_{\overline{\Gamma}}\big|_{\mathscr{X}_0}).\sqrt{\mathrm{td}(T_{\mathscr{X} \times_T \mathscr{X}'|T}\big|_{\mathscr{X}_0})} \\ &= \mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{O}_Z).\sqrt{\mathrm{td}(T_{X \times X'})} = v(\mathcal{O}_Z). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, applying the specialization map of Section 2.3, it is enough to show that the restrictions to the general fibre, $\alpha_\eta := r_\eta(\alpha)$ and $\beta_\eta := r_\eta(\beta)$, coincide.

Consider the graph Γ of the isomorphism $\mathscr{X}_\eta \cong \mathscr{X}'_\eta$, which is the restriction of $\mathscr{X}_{T\setminus\{0\}} \cong \mathscr{X}'_{T\setminus\{0\}}$. Then $\alpha_\eta = r_\eta([\overline{\Gamma}]) = [\overline{\Gamma}_\eta] = [\Gamma]$. Furthermore, one computes:

$$\beta_\eta = r_\eta\big(\mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{O}_{\overline{\Gamma}}).\sqrt{\mathrm{td}(T_{\mathscr{X} \times_T \mathscr{X}'|T})}\big) = \mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{O}_\Gamma).\sqrt{\mathrm{td}(T_{\mathscr{X}_\eta \times_{k(\eta)} \mathscr{X}'_\eta|k(\eta)})}.$$

Let $i_\Gamma : \Gamma \to \mathscr{X}_\eta \times_{k(\eta)} \mathscr{X}'_\eta$ denote the natural inclusion. Applying the Grothendieck–Riemann–Roch theorem (GRR) (see [Ful84, Theorem 15.2]) one then observes:

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_\eta &= \mathrm{ch}(i_{\Gamma *}\mathcal{O}_\Gamma).\,\mathrm{td}(T_{\mathscr{X}_\eta \times_{k(\eta)} \mathscr{X}'_\eta | k(\eta)}).\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{td}(T_{\mathscr{X}_\eta \times_{k(\eta)} \mathscr{X}'_\eta | k(\eta)})}} \\
&\overset{\text{(GRR)}}{=} i_{\Gamma *}\Big(\underbrace{\mathrm{ch}(\mathcal{O}_\Gamma)}_{=1}.\,\mathrm{td}(T_{\Gamma|k(\eta)}).\frac{1}{\sqrt{{i_\Gamma}^*\,\mathrm{td}(\mathrm{pr}^*_{\mathscr{X}_\eta}\, T_{\mathscr{X}_\eta|k(\eta)} \oplus \mathrm{pr}^*_{\mathscr{X}'_\eta}\, T_{\mathscr{X}'_\eta|k(\eta)})}}\Big) \\
&= i_{\Gamma *}\Big(\,\mathrm{td}(T_{\Gamma|k(\eta)}).\frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{td}(T_{\Gamma|k(\eta)}).\,\mathrm{td}(T_{\Gamma|k(\eta)})}}\Big) \\
&= i_{\Gamma *}(1_\Gamma) = [\Gamma] \\
&= \alpha_\eta.
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. ☐

Since the Chern character $\mathrm{ch} : K(X) \otimes \mathbb{Q} \to \mathrm{CH}_{\mathbb{Q}}(X)$ is an isomorphism of rings (see [Man69, Theorem 11.6]), one can conclude from (6.1), Corollary 3.5, Theorem 2.6 and Proposition 6.2 that:

Corollary 6.3. *On the level of rational Grothendieck rings the map* $\Phi^K_{v(\mathcal{O}_Z)}$ *is an isomorphism and in particular multiplicative.* ☐

Consider a general Mukai flop $X \leftarrow \hat{\mathrm{X}} \to X'$. Combining Theorem 6.1 with Balmer's result in [Bal02] shows that the Fourier–Mukai transform $\Phi_{\mathcal{O}_Z}$ is not compatible with the derived tensor product. Therefore, even in this special case, there is a priori no reason on the level of derived categories that $\Phi^K_{[\mathcal{O}_Z]}$ or $\Phi^{\mathrm{CH}}_{v(\mathcal{O}_Z)}$ should respect the ring structure.

References

[Art70] Michael Artin. Algebraization of formal moduli: II. - Existence of modifications. *Ann. Math. (2)*, 91:88–135, 1970.

[Bal02] Paul Balmer. Presheaves of triangulated categories and reconstruction of schemes. *Math. Ann.*, 324(3):557–580, 2002.

[Bea07] Arnaud Beauville. On the splitting of the Bloch–Beilinson filtration. In Jan Nagel and Chris Peters, editors, *Algebraic Cycles and Motives, (vol. 2)*, London Mathematical Society lecture note series 344, pages 38–53. Cambridge University Press, 2007.

[BV04] Arnaud Beauville and Claire Voisin. On the Chow ring of a K3 surface. *J. Alg. Geom.*, 13(3):417–426, 2004.

[FN72] Akira Fujiki and Shigeo Nakano. Supplement to "On the inverse of monoidal transformation". *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci., Kyoto Univ.*, 7:637–644, 1972.

[Ful84] William Fulton. *Intersection Theory*. Springer-Verlag, second edition, 1984.

[Har77] Robin Hartshorne. *Algebraic Geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 1977.

[HMS11] Daniel Huybrechts, Emanuele Macrì, and Paolo Stellari. Formal deformations and their categorical general fibre. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 86(1):41–71, 2011.

[Huy97] Daniel Huybrechts. Birational symplectic manifolds and their deformations. *J. Diff. Geom.*, 45(3):488–513, 1997.

[Huy99] Daniel Huybrechts. Compact hyperkähler manifolds: Basic results. *Invent. Math.*, 135(1):63–113, 1999.

[Huy03] Daniel Huybrechts. The Kähler cone of a compact hyperkähler manifold. *Math. Ann.*, 326(3):499–513, 2003.

[Huy06] Daniel Huybrechts. *Fourier–Mukai Transforms in Algebraic Geometry*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford Science Publications, 2006.

[Jan94] Uwe Jannsen. Motivic sheaves and filtrations on Chow groups. Jannsen, Uwe (ed.) et al., Motives. Proceedings of the summer research conference on motives, held at the University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA, July 20-August 2, 1991. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society. Proc. Symp. Pure Math. 55, Pt. 1, 1994.

[Man69] Yuri I. Manin. Lectures on the K-functor in algebraic geometry. *Russ. Math. Surv.*, 24(5):1–89, 1969.

[Muk84] Shigeru Mukai. Symplectic structure of the moduli space of sheaves on an abelian or K3 surface. *Invent. math.*, 77:101–116, 1984.

[Mum69] David Mumford. Rational equivalence of 0-cycles on surfaces. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 9:195–204, 1969.

[Nak71] Shigeo Nakano. On the inverse of monoidal transformation. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci., Kyoto Univ.*, 6:483–502, 1971.

[Nam03] Yoshinori Namikawa. Mukai flops and derived categories. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 560:65–76, 2003.

[Voi07] Claire Voisin. *Hodge Theory and Complex Algebraic Geometry, I*, volume 76 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.

[Voi08] Claire Voisin. On the Chow ring of certain algebraic hyper-Kähler manifolds. *Pure Appl. Math. Q.*, 4(3):613–649, 2008.

[Wie02] Jan Wierzba. Birational geometry of symplectic 4-folds. Unpublished preprint: `http://www.mimuw.edu.pl/~jarekw/postscript/bir4fd.ps`, 2002.

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, ENDENICHER ALLEE 60, 53115 BONN, GERMANY